



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,116	11/14/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008206-1	6990

7590 12/02/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/993,116	Applicant(s) SIMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Kyle R. Stork	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the amendment filed with the request for continued examination filed 6 September 2005.
2. Claims 37-66 are pending. Claims 1-36 are cancelled by the amendment. Claims 37-66 are newly added by the amendment. Claims 36, 55, 56, and 66 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 43, 45, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claims 43 and 60 the applicant claims "...generic access instructions." It would be unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art what instructions constitute "generic access instructions."

As per claim 45, the applicant claims "... unreliable web services..." It would be unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art what instructions constitute "unreliable web services."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 37-43 and 47-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudorf et al. (2002/0174230, filed 15 May 2001, hereafter Gudorf) and further in view of Linden et al. (US 2002/0019763, filed 29 March 2001, hereafter Linden).

As per independent claim 37, Gudorf discloses a system comprising:

- A browser having a user ID comprising a reference to a user profile associated with a profile store, the user profile comprising a reference to a graphics store and a composition store associated with a user (paragraphs 0026: Here, the system includes a browser; paragraph 0004: Here, a login screen is used to allow a user to identify himself/herself)
- A user profile server comprising the profile store, wherein the profile store comprises user specific data (paragraph 0004: Here, the login data is maintained at a remote site (server))
- A graphics store, wherein the graphics store is configured to enable network access by the browser of one or more graphics (paragraphs 0056-0059: Here, the references, including "nanny cam" and "local weather radar" are graphics retrieved from the graphics store by the composition store)

- A composition store, wherein the composition store comprises one or more compositions that determine the manner in which the one or more graphics are mapped into a series of web pages (paragraph 0045: Here, the composition store stores templates specifying how the user specific graphics populate the template)
- Wherein the browser is coupled over a network to the user profile server, the graphics store, and the composition store, and wherein the user specific data and the one or more graphics formatted according to the one ore more compositions available to a web service (paragraph 0056: Here, a user is presented a personalized web page via the user profile, graphics store, and composition store)

Gudorf fails to specifically disclose using separate servers for both the graphics store and the composition store. However, Gudorf does suggest using servers for data (paragraphs 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf's system with Gudorf's servers, since it would have allowed for greater processing performance and storage capacity (paragraph 0024).

Gudorf fails to specifically disclose use of applications program interface (API). However, Linden discloses use of an API (paragraph 0119: Here, a plug-in is an API). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf with Linden, since it would have allowed a user to report browsing activities for site customization (Linden: paragraph 0119).

As per dependent claim 38, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the user profile comprises a reference to a composition associated with the composition store, a reference to a default composition associated with the composition store, or a combination of both (paragraph 0045).

As per dependent claim 39, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 38, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the reference comprises a URL (paragraph 0026).

As per dependent claim 40, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the browser is configured to receive web content (paragraph 0026).

As per dependent claim 41, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 40. Gudorf further discloses responsive to activation by the web content, using the user ID to access a user profile (paragraph 0004). Linden further discloses use of an API (paragraph 0119). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf with Linden, since it would have allowed a user to report browsing activities for site customization (Linden: paragraph 0119).

As per dependent claim 42, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 41, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further disclose wherein responsive to the access of the user profile, the web browser is configured to present the web content using the user specific data (paragraph 0056).

As per dependent claim 43, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 40, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the web content comprises HTML commands and generic access instructions (paragraph 0026).

As per dependent claim 47, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the one or more compositions comprise a reference to the one or more graphics in the graphics store (paragraphs 0056-0062).

As per dependent claim 48, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the composition store comprises a default composition store (paragraph 0045).

As per dependent claim 49, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the one or more compositions comprise a default composition or default compositions (paragraphs 0045; 0056-0062).

As per dependent claim 50, Gudorf and Linden discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses creating one or more compositions stored in the same composition store (paragraph 0045: Here, a single composition store, a database, is disclosed; paragraphs 0056-0062: Here, there are different compositions for each web page, including the workplace and home web pages).

As per dependent claim 51, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 39. Claim 51 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 52, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitation similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the profile store comprises user specific data for a plurality of users (paragraph 0003).

As per dependent claim 53, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses changes to the user profile store (paragraph 0047). Linden discloses use of an API (paragraph 0119). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf with Linden, since it would have allowed a user to report browsing activities for site customization (Linden: paragraph 0119).

As per dependent claim 54, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein the graphics server provides text information (paragraphs 0056-0062: Here, each link is graphic data. This includes several pieces of text information).

As per independent claim 55, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 37. Gudorf further discloses authentication for verifying a user identity (paragraph 0004). Claim 55 is similarly rejected under Gudorf and Linden.

As per independent claim 56, the applicant discloses the method for providing the system of claim 37 personalized web pages. Claim 56 is similarly rejected under Gudorf and Linden.

As per dependent claim 57, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 39. Claim 57 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 58, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 56, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses accessing a server that comprises a location of the user profile (paragraph 0004).

As per dependent claim 59, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 41. Claim 59 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 60, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 56, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein creating one or more graphics is based on generic instructions corresponding to the web content (paragraph 0045). Linden discloses use of an API (paragraph 0119). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf with Linden, since it would have allowed a user to report browsing activities for site customization (Linden: paragraph 0119).

As per dependent claim 61, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 50. Claim 61 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 63, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 56, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein storing comprises storing in a single server (paragraph 0004).

As per dependent claim 64, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 56, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf further discloses wherein storing comprises storing in a plurality of servers (paragraphs 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf and Linden's system with Gudorf's servers, since it would have allowed for greater processing performance and storage capacity (paragraph 0024).

As per dependent claim 64, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 53. Claim 64 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 65, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 55. Claim 65 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 66, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 36. Claim 66 is similarly rejected.

7. Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudorf and Linden and further in view of Gillespie et al. (US 2002/0059243, filed 26 July 1999, hereafter Gillespie).

As per dependent claim 44, Gudorf and Linden disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 37, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gudorf fails to

Art Unit: 2178

specifically disclose wherein the graphics store is configured to enable manipulation of formats over the network for the one or more graphics. However, Gillespie discloses wherein the graphics store is configured to enable manipulation of formats over the network for the one or more graphics (paragraphs 0004-0005). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf and Linden with Gillespie, since it would have allowed a user to view remotely stored graphics without having the legacy system in which the images are stored (Gillespie: paragraph 0004).

As per dependent claim 45, Gudorf, Linden, and Gillespie disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 44, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gillespie further discloses where the graphics store comprises a default graphics store (paragraph 0006: Here, the converted images are stored in a database). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gudorf, Linden, and Gillespie with Gillespie, since it would have allowed a user to more rapidly access locally converted image data.

As per dependent claim 46, Gudorf, Linden, and Gillespie disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 44, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gillespie further discloses wherein, responsive to activation by web content, creating the one or more graphics and stores the same in the graphics store (paragraphs 0004-0006). Linden further discloses use of an API (paragraph 0119). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined

Gudorf, Linden, and Gillespie with Gillespie, since it would have allowed a user to easily view graphics data (Gillespie: paragraphs 0004-0006).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As disclosed above, the Gudorf, Linden, and Gillespie references have been added to address the applicant's amended claim limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

ks


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER